

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

(PCT Rule 43*bis*.1)

To: See Form PCT/ISA/220	<div style="text-align: right;">Date of mailing (Day/month/year) See Form PCT/ISA/210 (sheet 2)</div>	
Applicant's or agent's file reference See Form PCT/ISA/220	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International file reference PCT/EP2004/010141	International filing date (Day/Month/Year) 10/09/2004	Priority date (Day/Month/Year) 16/10/2003
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC D01H13/32		
Applicant SAURER GMBH & CO. KG		

1.	This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. I <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. II <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Box No. III <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. IV <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. V <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VI <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VII <input type="checkbox"/> Box No. VIII	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43 <i>bis</i> .1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Certain documents cited Certain defects in the international application Certain observations on the international application
2.	FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 <i>bis</i> (b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.
3.	For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220

Name and mailing address of the ISA European Patent Office – P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk – Netherlands Tel. +31 70 340 -2040, Tx: 31 651 epo nl Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016	Authorised officer D'Souza, J Tel. +31 70 340 – 4236 EPO stamp
--	--

10/575688

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

**International Application No.
PCT/EP2004/010141**

IAP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 13 APR 2006

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, if nothing else is stated under this item.

☐ The opinion is based on a translation from the original language into the following, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

**International Application No.
PCT/EP2004/010141**

Box No. II Priority

1. X The following document has not yet been filed:

 X Copy of the earlier application, the priority of which is claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ Translation of the earlier application, the priority of which is claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

It was therefore not possible to check the validity of the priority claim. The opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority has been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☐ It was not possible to check the validity of the priority claim, due to the fact that no copy of the priority document was available to the International Searching Authority at the time of the search (Rule 17.1). This opinion was therefore established assuming that the relevant date for the examination is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

**International Application No.
PCT/EP2004/010141**

**Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and
industrial applicability**

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of the following parts of the application

☒ the entire international application

☐ claims Nos.

because:

☐ the entire international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to
the following subject matter which does not require an international search (*specify*):

☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims
Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the
description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☒ no international search report has been established for the entire application or for said
claims Nos.

☐ The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard
provided in Annex C of the administrative instructions, because

the written form ☐ was not filed.
☐ does not comply to the standard.

the computer-readable form ☐ was not filed.
☐ does not correspond with the standard.

☐ The tables regarding the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if they are only in
computer-readable form, do not correspond to the technical requirements specified in
Annex C-*bis* of the administrative instructions.

☐ See supplementary sheets for further details.

10/575688

AP20 Rec'd PCT/PTO 12 APR 2006
International Application No. 2006
PCT/EP2004/010141

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING
AUTHORITY (SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)**

Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

A reasonable search on the basis of all the claims is not possible, as these relate to – presentation of information – Rule 39.1(v) PCT. See PCT Guidelines 9.11 – 9.14.